

## PINAL COUNTY CORRIDORS DEFINITION STUDY

Contract T0449-0001

ADOT Purchase Order No. PGKG 2465

### TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NO. 3

April 5, 2005

Arizona Department of Transportation

206 S. 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue

Board Room

1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

### ATTENDANCE

#### Technical Advisory Committee

Dianne Kresich, Arizona Department  
of Transportation (Project Manager)

Mark Young, Town of Queen Creek

Ken Buchanan, Pinal County

Rick Powers, Arizona Department of  
Transportation

Larry Quick, Town of Florence

Ron Grittmann, City of Apache  
Junction

Tim Oliver, Maricopa Department of  
Transportation

Sandra Shade, Gila River Indian  
Community

Doug Torres, Gila River Indian  
Community

John Roberts, Gila River Indian  
Community

James Moline, Gila River Indian  
Community

Anne MacCracken, Regional Public  
Transit Authority/Valley Metro\*

Dempsey Holmes, Arizona State  
Land Department

Ken Hall, Maricopa Association of  
Governments

Joe Blanton, City of Eloy

Alton Bruce, City of Coolidge

Don Freeman, Pima Association of  
Governments

#### Consultant Staff

Dave Perkins, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Brent Crowther, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Carol Oaks, Kaneen Public Relations

### MEETING SUMMARY

The third meeting of the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held on April 5, 2005 at the Arizona Department of Transportation. The meeting began at 1:00 p.m. and adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

### 1. Opening Remarks and Introductions

Dianne Kresich opened the meeting. She thanked the TAC for their attendance and participation, and asked each individual to introduce themselves and to state the agency that they represent. Dianne introduced Dave Perkins who reviewed the TAC meeting agenda.

### 2. Progress Summary

Dave Perkins stated that the primary objective of the TAC meeting is to brief the TAC on the information that will be presented and on display at the upcoming open houses. In addition, he stated that very preliminary travel demand model results have been produced by Cambridge Systematics, Inc. and Lima & Associates and that he would informally discuss Kimley-Horn's initial reactions to the model outputs and invite TAC perspectives and comments. Dave emphasized that the model is still very preliminary, and that no conclusions have been or will be reached until the model results are reviewed in further detail. Dave stated that the model will be reviewed in April by ADOT and the three corridor study teams. Because the modeling is still in a very preliminary state, modeling results will not be presented at the public open houses. Modeling results will be included in Working Paper No. 1 - Existing and Future Conditions.

Dave reviewed other activities of the study team that have occurred over the past two months. Activities primarily focused on completing Jurisdictional Working group meetings, providing input to the travel demand model preparation, and scheduling the open houses.

Meetings were also held with Pinal County elected officials and with the City of Chandler Transportation Commission. Dave stated that valuable input was received at both of these meetings. Dave stated that a meeting with the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) has not yet been scheduled, but will hopefully be scheduled in the near future. In response, Sandra Shade stated that the GRIC is willing to meet and would like ADOT to provide some potential dates to meet with community representatives.

### 3. Travel Demand Modeling

Dave Perkins stated that Cambridge Systematics, Inc. has completed the developed population and employment projections for inclusion in the travel demand model. Dave noted that the travel demand model will be used by all three study teams (US 60, Williams Gateway, and Pinal County Corridors). The Central Arizona College Bond Feasibility Study provides the basis for 2030 population projections in Pinal County. Use of the BFS was recommended by many jurisdictions during the Jurisdictional Working Group meetings, including the Central Arizona Association of Governments and Pinal County. Use of the CAC Bond Feasibility Study as an input to the travel demand model was presented to stakeholders at the January 31, 2005 TAC Meeting. Input to population estimates were also received from the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), Central Arizona Association of Governments, and the Arizona State Land Department.

The transportation networks for the travel demand model was prepared by Lima & Associates. Assumptions regarding the future transportation network were necessary to develop to distribute future traffic in the region. As development occurs it was assumed that the local transportation network will be developed to support the increased population. Because the Pinal County Small Area Transportation Plan won't be completed until late 2005, assumptions of the 2030 future network were made. In Pinal County, the assumed 2030 road system included both the widening of existing roadways and the construction of new roadways. It is understood that the future 2030 transportation network is subject to change as a result of future and ongoing local, county, and state transportation planning studies. Dave stated that it is important to recognize that the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study will not recommend a specific local road system, and no implications should be made as such. However, development of the travel demand model requires assumptions on the local road system and connectivity to the study areas (East Valley and the Apache Junction/Coolidge). The 2030 road system developed by Lima & Associates was reviewed with Pinal County staff for reasonableness. In the MAG planning region, the 2030 road system prepared for the travel demand model reflects the adopted MAG regional transportation plan.

A question was asked on the comparison between the 2030 population and socioeconomic projections prepared for this study as compared to the 2003 Southeast Maricopa County Northern Pinal County Transportation Study (SEMNPTS). Dave stated that Lima & Associates will provide an answer to that question and that the differences will be documented in Working Paper 1 and presented at the next TAC meeting. It was also asked if DES (Arizona Department of Economic Security) constraints were used. Dave stated that the model did not utilize DES constraints. A TAC member stated that in his experience the DES numbers are generally reasonable but that they do not accurately reflect population dispersion throughout the region.

Another question was asked about the southern limits of the model. Dave stated that the model extends from north of US 60 to south of Eloy. Limitations of the model may make it difficult to understand how a north/south corridor influences travel on I-10. Dave stated that Kimley-Horn, Lima & Associates, and Cambridge Systematics will meet in April to discuss this and other modeling issues. The response to this question will be documented in Working Paper 1 and presented at the next TAC meeting.

Dave Perkins showed the results of three model runs that will be on display at the open houses. These models include the 2004 population on the 2004 network (existing conditions), 2030 traffic projections on the 2004 network (no-build), and 2030 traffic projections on a future arterial network (enhanced network).

Dave presented the "existing conditions" model run showing near and over-capacity conditions in the study area. The "no-build" model run showed that most of the roadways within the study area were over-capacity, confirming jurisdictional perspectives that significant enhancements to the local road system are warranted to meet 2030 development. The 2030 "enhanced network" model run showed a reduction in the number of roadways that are near or over-capacity. Dave explained that this preliminary finding was consistent with the conclusions reached in the 2003 SEMNPTS. Dave did indicate that over-capacity roadways still existed with the enhanced network.

in areas between Florence/Coolidge and Queen Creek/Williams Gateway and in the Chandler/Gilbert area.

Dave led a TAC discussion on the preliminary model results as they relate to conclusions of the 2003 SEMNPTS. One TAC member stated that the 2003 SEMNPTS study did not include population growth on State Trust Land. Another TAC member stated that a concentration of trips typically results in over-capacity conditions. He stated that the study should carefully examine how the socioeconomic data is distributed in the study area. Another TAC member stated that he needed to see the model results before he can state whether he agrees with the findings.

Dave Perkins asked the TAC if there was an understanding that the 'new' corridors were justified by the 2003 study. One TAC member stated that the preliminary model results tended to support the findings of the 2003 SEMNPTS. Another TAC member stated that while 2030 arterial network may meet local travel demand, there still exists a lack of connectivity between jurisdictions. He questioned how the travel demand model can accurately reflect traffic projections without modeling I-10 and US 60. Another TAC member stated that the model does account for I-10 and US 60 in terms of external stations. He stated that traffic is distributed throughout the system in response to capacity of external stations. Another TAC member asked if the model is accounting for population growth in the Tucson area.

One TAC member pointed out that the model provides only three southeast to northwest corridors, providing initial justification for the Apache Junction/Coolidge corridor.

One TAC member asked if the study could result in a possible conclusion that the corridors are not needed, and that only an arterial system is needed. Dave stated that regardless of whether the corridors are needed, an enhanced local road system is needed. Any major transportation corridor would require an arterial system to provide access to the corridor. The TAC member stated that the connectivity needs to be established between activity centers.

Dianne Kresich stated that ADOT views construction of the local arterial system as the responsibility of local agencies. Major transportation corridors may be needed to supplement the local road system (as recommended by this study) and could serve as State highways but it is the responsibility of local jurisdictions to establish the 2030 local transportation network.

When asked whether the findings of the 3 studies (e.g. US 60, Williams Gateway, Pinal County Corridors) will be consistent with one another, Dianne Kresich stated that a final report will be produced that will be the synthesis of the three studies.

#### 4. Preview of Public Open Houses

Dianne Kresich provided a brief overview of the presentation that will be made at the Public Open Houses. The presentation will include a discussion of the study process and public involvement elements of the study. She will emphasize that the study team is soliciting input from many stakeholders and has established a Technical Advisory Committee to gather input from each of the affected jurisdictions. Dianne will also review

some of the key issues that have been identified as a result of the local jurisdictions working group meetings.

## 5. TAC Comments

Dave Perkins provided an additional opportunity to each TAC member to ask questions and provide comments.

- § James Moline asked that GRIC be specifically added to one open house presentation slide.
- § Don Freeman suggested that the wording in the open house presentation be modified to emphasize that no conclusions on corridor need have been made and that funding would have to be identified if either of the corridors are determined to be needed or feasible.
- § Tim Oliver stated that it needs to be emphasized that ADOT is not yet building anything. This study will determine purpose and need for the corridors at their most basic level. If a need is established, the feasibility will then be determined. He stated that a lot of confusion exists regarding the corridors, and that people mistakenly believe that the corridors are defined.
- § Ken Buchanan stated that Pinal County is currently conducting a transportation impact fee study.
- § Mark Young stated that there will be groups at the Open Houses who openly oppose the East Valley Corridor on either the Hunt Highway or Riggs Road alignment.
- § Alton Bruce stated that he feels that people will be asking us to draw the lines back onto the map.
- § Ron Grittmann stated that he wants to review the model results. He requested that the TAC members be provided with the data prior to TAC meetings.
- § Sandra Shade stated that it should be emphasized that this is a transportation planning study, that the corridors are not a given, and that coordination with GRIC does not imply that the corridors could be located on community lands. GRIC is just like any other city and town with its own processes and elected leaders.
- § Larry Quick stated that the study area map, as opposed to the corridors map, is important. He also stated that development of arterials could serve the purpose of the corridors.

## 7. What's Next?

- § Open Houses will be conducted over the next two weeks in Apache Junction, Coolidge, Queen Creek and Chandler.
- § The study teams will be meeting to discuss preliminary modeling results.
- § Work will continue on analyzing the travel demand modeling results.
- § Working Paper No. 1 - Existing and Future Conditions will be completed.
- § Work will begin on Summary Report No. 1 –Corridor Needs and Deficiencies.

## 8. Adjournment